

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/046,263	01/16/2002	Toshihiko Fukuoka	60188-144	3551	
75	590 06/13/2006		EXAMINER		
Jack Q. Lever, Jr.			HOANG, THAI D		
McDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 600 Thirteenth Street, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, DC 20005-3096 2616					
			DATE MAILED: 06/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•			\
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	- 4
		10/046,263	FUKUOKA ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Thai D. Hoang	2616	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this c mmunication app r Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address	-
A SHO WHIC - Exter after: - If NO - Failur Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY SHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period verse to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, pely received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to the second will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed not this communication (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status				
2a)⊠ 3)□	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>Ameronal Ameronal Amerona</u>	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pr		is
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Application 9)□ -	Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,2 and 7-9 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 3-6 and 10-13 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the or Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction.	vn from consideration. r election requirement. r. epted or b)□ objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	(d).
11) 🔲 -	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.	٠
Pri rity u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau ee the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicative documents have been received in (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage	
2) D Notice 3) Inform	(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date 01/16/2002.	4) Interview Summan Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:		

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kodama et al., US patent application publication 2002/0004925 A1 in view of Chappell et al., US patent application publication 2003/0014763 A1, hereinafter referred to as Kodama and Chappell respectively.

Regarding claims 1 and 8, as best understood, Kodama discloses an error correcting device, wherein the device comprises:

an error correcting circuit 42 (figs. 1, 7, 10-12, 39 or element 4, fig. 39) that receives input data from a receiving circuit 1, and performs error detection and error correction of the received data block (8 bits) (a parity check block for receiving the 8-bit byte data which has been converted by the data rearrangement block, and performing an MPEG sync byte detection operation and a parity-check-based error detection operation using the received byte data);

a storage device 41 (figs. 1, 7, 10-12, 39 or element 3, fig. 39) for receiving and storing 8 bit data block received from a receiving circuit 1 and from the output of error correcting circuit. Also, Kodama discloses that the receiving circuit receives a synchronization signal located at the head of each one frame of a data format (a data

storage block, capable of receiving/outputting 8-bit byte data, for receiving and storing the 8-bit byte data, which has been converted by the data rearrangement block, and 8-bit intermediate byte data produced during a calculation process for the MPEG sync byte detection operation and the parity-check-based error detection operation performed by the parity check block); and

a transmission circuit 5 for outputting data and synchronization signal.

Kodama does not disclose that the system comprises a data rearrangement for receiving 7-bit data and converting the 7-bit data to 8-bit data. However, Chappell discloses this feature in paragraph [0008]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Chappell's converter into the system disclosed by Kodama in order to adapt with conventional systems using Reed-Solomon code.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Chappell does not explicitly disclose how the system converts 7 bit data block to 8 bit data block. However, the method of using shift registers to convert 7 bit data block of the data stream to 8 bit data block is well known in the logic design. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use shift registers to convert 7 bit data block to 8 bit data block in order to fit with 8 bit MPEG data block.

Regarding claim 7, Kodama discloses the storage is a RAM, paragraph [0114].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 05/01/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 4

Pages 13-14 of the marks, Applicants argue, "in the data rearrangement step disclosed by Chappel, RS parity symbol filtering is accomplished by suppressing the 7-bit to 8-bit conversion. That is, the 7-bit to 8-bit conversion is restarted on completion of the RS parity symbol filtering. Accordingly, the RS parity symbol filtering is performed in the step before the 7-bit to 8-bit conversion". Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner used Chappel's reference (paragraph [0008]) to reject the first imitation of the claim 1, which recites "a data rearrangement for receiving 7-bit data and converting the 7-bit data to 8-bit data;" Examiner believes that this argument is not relevant because it is directed to subject matter not found in the claims, because the claim does not recite the parity symbol filtering is performed in the step before or after the 7-bit to 8-bit conversion.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3-6 and 10-13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Application/Control Number: 10/046,263

Art Unit: 2616

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Page 5

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thai D. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 272-

3184. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 10:00am-6:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Doris To can be reached on (571) 272-7629. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thai Hoang

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600